REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the prompt and thorough Office Action dated June 6, 2002.

The Applicant makes the restriction with traversal. The Examiner stated that, in the instant case, the product as claimed "in claims 1 through 5" can be made by another and materially different process. For example, the films can be selectively deposited. Applicant submits that claims 6 through 20 and the claims added below cover the process for making a semiconductor device that includes selectively depositing films. As referenced in the specification, FIGs. 6 and 7, the addition of a mask layer is described by selectively adding a first mask film, a second mask film, and finally a third mask film. While it is possible that the claims may be interpreted to encompass methods that do not selectively deposit the mask films, the specification specifically references such a selective deposition of mask films. Similarly, the claim 21-29 set forth a method of fabricating a semiconductor device that encompasses selectively depositing the mask films.

If further prosecution of this application can be facilitated via telephone conference, the Examining Attorney is invited to contact the undersigned at (407) 926-7706.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert L. Wolter, Esquire Registration No. 36,972

Beusse Brownlee Bowdoin & Wolter, P.A.

390 North Orange Ave., Suite 2500

Orlando, Florida 32801 Telephone: (407) 926-7706 Facsimile: (407) 926-7720

Email: rwolter@iplawfl.com





Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Amendment was furnished by First Class Mail to the Commissioner of Patents, Box Fee Amendment, Washington, DC 20231, this 6th day of November, 2002.

Gwendolyn C. Rainsey

5